

also have in my hand the President's Social Security plan; and, lo and behold, the President's Social Security plan, delivered to the House with much ado and great fanfare, assumes a \$50 billion reduction in discretionary spending for Fiscal Year 2000 as the predicate clause for this savings he is going to use to save Social Security.

Fifty billion dollars. No suggestion of offsets. No suggestions of reality. No input from the Congress. Just a blanket \$50 billion reduction in discretionary spending.

I am confused, and apparently the President is, too.

A 1-PERCENT CUT IN THE BUDGET DOES NOT CUT WASTE

(Mr. GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Social Security program is one of our most successful domestic programs ever created. It guarantees retirement security benefits for millions of Americans, and yet what we are seeing now today as the Republican majority's budget process uses 17 billion in Social Security Trust Fund, this budget process did nothing for Social Security, did nothing for Medicare and hurts every family. The bill does not extend Social Security 1 day, 1 day, and it provides not one penny for a prescription benefit for Medicare recipients. The only thing it does do is it hurts every American family, but they did want to provide an irresponsible tax cut that somehow they forgot about the last few days.

A 1-percent cut in the budget does not cut waste. Ninety-nine percent spending for a carrier that the Navy does not want and does not need is still 99 percent waste. What they are doing though is saying: well, we are not going to cut our pork; we are going to cut everybody. But let me tell my colleagues that carrier is still going to be built, and it is still going to be waste.

The budget gimmick of putting off the research for medical with the NIH is atrocious. What they are doing is playing with people's lives that have cancer and diabetes, just to name a few.

HOW REPUBLICANS VOTED IN 1935

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, how many times have you heard it from that side of the aisle, the Democrats, that Republicans voted against creation of the Social Security program back in 1935? That is flat wrong. If ever a vote has been mischaracterized, this is it. Here are the facts, and many of our colleagues might be surprised to know that 79 percent of the 95 Republicans who voted in the House voted for

this important program; and in the Senate, 75 percent of the 20 Republicans who voted cast their vote in support of this legislation. What is even more interesting about this vote is that over a dozen Democrats voted against this measure. Following this line of reasoning, it could be said that Democrats did not support the Social Security Act when this was approved in 1935.

The truth is that both Republicans and Democrats voted to enact this legislation to establish this important program. Let the record speak for itself.

CUT WASTE, NOT PROGRAMS

(Mr. WISE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose this irresponsible Republican brought-to-the-floor budget bill. This bill does not extend the life of Social Security by 1 day. It does nothing to deal with the problem of high prescription drug prices, does not add one penny for Medicare prescription drug benefit. It does, though, hurt West Virginia families in very real ways.

People talk about cutting waste, a 1 percent cut across the board they say will cut waste. Well, let us find the waste and cut that, but let us not go after the very programs that West Virginia families depend upon. For instance, the Head Start mother who is going to find that her child will not be able to go to Head Start. Or what about the family who is concerned about the war on crime and finds out that 110 FBI agents will have to be cut under this? What about the veteran that came up to me at the Black Walnut Festival concerned about veterans health care and finds out the real cuts in veterans health care in this budget bill? And what about the hundreds of students in high poverty areas that are not going to qualify for the educational assistance programs they have been receiving?

Bad bill, Mr. Speaker. Vote it down.

EMPOWER HEALTH CARE CONSUMERS

(Mr. ROYCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, currently employers and employees can set aside pre-tax money that can be used for out-of-pocket health care expenses and co-payments and deductibles, and these are called flexible spending accounts. There is a problem in the current law, Mr. Speaker, and that is, if our constituents use these accounts and they do not completely use them up at the end of the year, that money reverts to the employer.

I have a bill, H.R. 3034, that would fix this use-it-or-lose-it provision and would allow this to be rolled over from

year to year; and basically under my legislation, which I hope the House will pass, \$3,000 annually can be put into these accounts. This would help portability. In other words, these accounts can go from job to job as employees change jobs. It would boost consumer choice because one would not be locked into the current health insurance plan. They could use this money at their own discretion. It would help the doctor-patient relationship by empowering consumers to make their own decisions about their own health care needs, and it would help control health insurance costs.

I hope all of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, will support this legislation.

TREAT OUR SENIORS BETTER

(Mr. WYNN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, good morning.

I rise to speak about how we treat those in the twilight of life, our seniors, our parents and our grandparents.

Contrary to what my colleagues may have heard earlier this morning, Democrats have always supported Social Security. On the other hand, Republican leaders have not. They have, in fact, urged that it be abolished, phased out or, Mr. Speaker, let it wither on the vine.

Specifically today, however, they are talking about not spending the Social Security Trust Fund, but unfortunately the CBO has documented that in fact they have spent it to the tune of \$17 billion of Social Security Trust Fund money that is being spent by the Republican leadership in this year's budget.

□ 1030

Do not be fooled by the gimmicks and the 13-month year. The fact of the matter is they are spending Social Security.

Additionally, they do not extend the solvency of Social Security. President Clinton and the Democrats have a proposal to extend the solvency of the Social Security trust fund to the year 2050.

Third, they do not do a thing about providing a prescription drug benefit for seniors. We have a proposal to provide prescription drug benefits in the Medicare Program.

Let us treat our seniors better. Let us reject the Republican budget proposals.

TRIBUTE TO VIRGIL COVINGTON, PRINCIPAL, WINBURN MIDDLE SCHOOL

(Mr. FLETCHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I want to interrupt this demagoguery from